Inside this issue:

- **From Failed Coup to Possible Hot War With Iran**
- **Growing Number of States Propose Eliminating Property Taxes**
- **EU-India Trade Pact: Boosting Commerce, Opening Floodgates**
- **Continued Push for Deeper European Integration**
- **Does Turbulence in the Commodities Markets Offer a "Silver" Lining for the Emerging Shadow-banking Sector?**
- **The UN Is Broke**
- **Countries Reaffirm Support for UN**
- **From Petrodollar Protection to Nuclear Revival: AI's Ironic Role in Currency Evolution**
- **Trump Sues JPMorgan for Debanking His Family After J6**
- **Clintons Agree to Testify in House Epstein Investigation Amid Contempt Threat**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

From Failed Coup to Possible Hot War With Iran

As tensions escalate in the Middle East, U.S. military actions signal a potential shift toward direct confrontation with Iran, warn military experts such as Colonel Douglas Macgregor (Ret.). In a January 26 interview at the Vancouver Resource Investment Conference, Macgregor detailed how failed CIA and Mossad efforts to exploit Iranian protests have paved the way for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's push for all-out war — now seemingly manifesting in emergency U.S. troop deployments to Israel.

Macgregor explained that Iran's recent demonstrations, sparked by severe economic hardships from U.S. sanctions, began as legitimate grievances over inflation and currency devaluation. However, these protests were hijacked by external forces. Mossad, in collaboration with the CIA, supplied 40,000 Starlink terminals to orchestrate a violent regime change, in an attempt to install a pro-Western government. The operation backfired: Iranian authorities captured around 6,000 operatives, many executed as traitors. This failure not only strengthened Iran's internal cohesion but also bolstered its military capabilities, leaving the regime more resilient than before U.S. strikes on its nuclear sites in June 2025.

With "soft power" regime change off the table, factions from the Likud party in Israel have reportedly demanded military force to eliminate Iran as a regional obstacle to Israeli dominance. Macgregor highlighted Netanyahu's vision of "unchallenged supremacy" over the region, with Iran standing as the primary barrier. He claimed President Trump has acquiesced to the proponents of the Greater Israel project, leading to a massive U.S. buildup — including the USS *Abraham Lincoln* Carrier Strike Group and advanced weapon systems — poised for possible action. Such developments risk closing the Strait of Hormuz, disrupting global oil flows and drawing in China (which sources a third of its oil from the region) and Russia, potentially escalating a regional situation into something more.

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez
William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2026 by *The New American*

This analysis aligns with a recent tweet from journalist Ann Vandersteel, who reported receiving a text about an "emergency deployment" of activated U.S. forces to Israel next week for a "security posture against Iran attacks." Vandersteel questioned the authorization and risks to American troops, quoting Blackwater founder Erik Prince's criticism: "I Do Not Want US Foreign Policy Dictated by What Is Good for Tel Aviv." The deployment, part of the largest U.S. buildup since last year's strikes, includes naval assets, F-35 jets, and missile defenses, ostensibly to deter Iranian retaliation amid domestic unrest where thousands have been killed.

Critics like Macgregor warn that this path lacks strategy, mirroring failed interventions in Ukraine and elsewhere. The intent, he argues, is to "destroy Iran as a civilizational state," but at what cost? With gold surging past $5,500 an ounce amid fears of dollar collapse and geopolitical shocks, are we facing a hot war? — Rebecca Terrell

Growing Number of States Propose Eliminating Property Taxes

A growing number of states are considering proposals to limit and ultimately abolish property taxes, reflecting greater support for property rights among landowners and — at least in rhetoric — state leaders.

The Associated Press recently reported on the increasing number of state proposals to phase out property taxes:

> Officials in North Dakota say they are on their way, using state oil money. Wednesday, Republicans in the Georgia House unveiled a complex effort to phase out homeowner property taxes by 2032. In Florida, GOP Gov. Ron DeSantis says that is his goal, with lawmakers currently considering phasing out nonschool property taxes on homeowners over 10 years. And in Texas, Republican Gov. Greg Abbott says he wants to eliminate property taxes for schools.
>
> Republicans are echoing those who say taxes, especially when the taxman can seize a house for nonpayment, mean no one truly owns property.
>
> "No one should ever face the loss of their home because they can't pay rent to the government," Georgia Republican House Speaker Jon Burns of Newington said [on January 28].

Additionally, as we reported in our December 5, 2025 "Insider Report," Wyoming legislators are advancing several measures to reduce or eliminate property taxes.

Ohio and Oklahoma may hold ballot measures this year to eliminate property taxes. A ballot measure on a state constitutional amendment to prohibit state property taxes in Tennessee has already been confirmed for November, but it would not affect local property taxes. Previous ballot measures to reduce or eliminate property taxes have not always been successful. In 2024, a North Dakota ballot measure to eliminate local property taxes failed by a 27-point margin after state and local officials warned about lost revenue and cuts to government services.

In our article "Restore State Government," published in the October 14, 2024 issue of *The New American*, we

noted why property taxes are incompatible with the American form of government:

> Property taxes — which amount to paying rent to the government in order to live on one's own property — are an even greater violation of individual freedom. Although they are levied by local governments (counties, municipalities, school districts, etc.), state governments ultimately decide how — if at all — localities may tax property. The Founding Fathers recognized the importance of property rights in a free society. For example, John Adams, in *A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*, declared that "the moment the idea is admitted into society, that property is not as sacred as the laws of God … anarchy and tyranny commence." And Madison, in *The Federalist*, No. 10, noted that democracy is "incompatible with … the rights of property." However, property taxes are currently levied in virtually every county. As of 2022, the average state property-tax rate ranged from 0.26 percent in Hawaii to 2.08 percent in New Jersey. In 15 counties — all in California, New Jersey, New York, and Virginia — the median property tax owed annually exceeds $10,000. In *Property Rights: As Sacred as the Laws of God*, John Birch Society CEO Emeritus Art Thompson notes how property taxes are antithetical to property rights: "Try not paying your taxes and you will soon find out whether you own your property, or whether the government really owns it in the fullest sense of the word."

The Associated Press report discussed how states will replace the lost revenue, with North Dakota using oil funds, Texas using surplus funds, and Georgia increasing sales taxes. However, these strategies ignore the fact that the size and scope of government — including at the local level — can and should be reined in significantly. For example, primary and secondary education is not a legitimate function of government — and public schools were virtually nonexistent before the late 1800s — yet it comprises a massive state and local expenditure today. Thus, instead of trying to replace lost revenue, states should focus on cutting all spending that does not align with the proper role of government.

The growing support for eliminating property taxes is encouraging, but state officials must follow through — and reduce the size and scope of their state and local governments in the process. Creating an electorate that is both informed and activated will increase the likelihood of this happening. — Peter Rykowski

EU-India Trade Pact: Boosting Commerce, Opening Floodgates

The European Union and India have sealed a comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (FTA), hailed as the "mother of all deals" by EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen. Finalized on January 26 during the 16th India-EU Summit in Delhi, the pact eliminates or reduces tariffs on 96.6 percent of EU exports to India, marking the most extensive market opening India has ever conceded to a trade partner. This agreement is projected to double EU exports to India by 2032, from the current €180 billion in bilateral trade, while saving European exporters €4 billion annually in duties.

Negotiations were initiated in 2007, stalled in 2013 over disputes on automobiles, agriculture, and intellectual property, and revived in 2022. The recent acceleration reflects mutual efforts to diversify away from U.S. dependence, especially with President Donald Trump's tariff threats looming, and to counter China's economic dominance. As von der Leyen noted, the deal fortifies a "rules-based trade order" in turbulent times.

Key provisions favor European industries: Indian tariffs on cars plummet from 110 percent to 10 percent over five years, with quotas for 250,000 vehicles; wines and

spirits drop from 150 percent to 20-40 percent; olive oil, pasta, and chocolate see full elimination. Machinery, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals — comprising more than half of EU exports — will benefit from zero or reduced duties up to 44 percent. In exchange, the EU zeros out tariffs on Indian jewelry, textiles, furniture, leather, metals, and chemicals, potentially creating millions of jobs in India and enhancing its "Make in India" manufacturing push.

The FTA extends beyond goods, granting EU firms unprecedented access to India's services sector, including financial and maritime transport. Enhanced intellectual property protections cover copyrights, trademarks, and plant varieties. A sustainability chapter mandates environmental safeguards, labor rights, and climate cooperation, backed by a new EU-India climate platform with €500 million in EU funding for India's green transition.

A parallel mobility agreement facilitates easier movement for Indian students, researchers, seasonal workers, and alleged "highly skilled professionals" to Europe. The EU's inaugural Legal Gateway Office in India will streamline visas. While proponents argue this addresses labor shortages in sectors such as engineering and healthcare, critics decry it as a veiled immigration surge. Echoing sentiments in Canada, where similar influxes have strained housing and services, European nationalists warn of demographic shifts and cultural dilution. With India's 1.4 billion population, even limited migration could overwhelm European welfare systems, fueling debates over sovereignty and border control.

Geopolitically, the deal underscores a multipolar world, reducing reliance on U.S. markets and potentially inspiring similar pacts. However, analysts such as those at the Atlantic Council temper enthusiasm, noting modest global impacts due to phased implementations and exclusions for sensitive EU agriculture (e.g., beef, rice). For history buffs, this pivot East reminds one of the British Empire's choice in 1776: Only having enough troops to maintain their colonies in America or to consolidate their empire in India, the British chose India. The outside observer cannot help but feel the City of London financial district (which largely controls the European Union through the Euro-dollar market) is making the same decision 250 years later. — Rebecca Terrell

Continued Push for Deeper European Integration

Eurocrats are continuing — and apparently intensifying — their push for further integrating the European Union into a full-fledged "United States of Europe."

On February 2, Mario Draghi, who formerly served as president of the European Central Bank and prime minister of Italy, gave a speech where he called for a federal Europe. *Politico* reports:

> EU countries shouldn't be afraid of integrating at different speeds if that's what it takes to gain crucial leverage on the world stage, Mario Draghi said Monday….
>
> "Power requires Europe to move from confederation to federation," said Draghi, stressing that only in domains where EU countries have pooled their competences has the bloc gained clout on the global stage.
>
> "Where Europe has federated, [such as] on trade, on competition, on the single market, on monetary policy, we are respected as a power and negotiate as one," he said, citing trade agreements recently negotiated with India and Latin America….
>
> In the face of those challenges, areas of weakness are those where EU capitals continue to maintain a grip, such as defense, industrial policy or foreign affairs, Draghi said. In these, he added, "we are

> treated as a loose assembly of middle-sized states to be divided and dealt with accordingly."

Draghi is not alone in advocating further European integration. *The Washington Post* reported on January 28 that six European countries — France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland, and the Netherlands — were actively discussing the creation of a "two-speed" EU, where certain countries integrate more quickly than others, to bypass countries such as Hungary that are more resistant to European integration.

Additionally, Reuters reported that Germany and Italy have issued a policy paper calling for deeper integration in the name of "competitiveness":

> The policy paper was drawn up for the Leaders' Retreat in Alden Biesen in Belgium on February 12, where German Chancellor Friedrich Merz and Italian Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni will press for a coordinated EU strategy to support businesses, attract investment and strengthen the single market.
>
> Germany and Italy also advocate deeper integration in services, energy, capital markets and digital industries, a pan-European stock exchange and revised merger rules to help companies compete globally.

Meloni's participation in this push for deeper integration is disappointing, but not necessarily surprising, since many European conservative populists have abandoned or watered down their prior opposition to the EU for electoral or political purposes.

Meanwhile, the United Kingdom under Prime Minister Keir Starmer is openly considering surrendering his country's sovereignty to the EU — nearly 10 years after Brits voted to withdraw the U.K. from the EU entirely — in return for access to the bloc's single market. In fact, *Politico* reported, Starmer began this effort last year:

> In May last year Starmer effectively agreed to take the U.K. back into Brussels' orbit in two sectors: agriculture and electricity.
>
> Those agreements, which are currently being finalized, will see the U.K. follow relevant EU regulations — in exchange for more seamless market access.

As *The New American* has previously reported, regional unions such as the EU are steppingstones toward world government. By integrating nation-states into a complicated web of regional organizations, it becomes easier to lay the groundwork for a world-government structure, and with less backlash from the public.

These developments make it ever more important that we inform our elected officials and fellow citizens about the true aims of the EU and similar regional unions — and work to prevent a similar surrender of sovereignty in the United States. — Peter Rykowski

Does Turbulence in the Commodities Markets Offer a "Silver" Lining for the Emerging Shadow-banking Sector?

As commodity prices surge in early 2026, with silver experiencing what analysts call the "greatest short squeeze in history," Americans are growing increasingly nervous about potential bank collapses. Banks such as JP Morgan and Citigroup, holding massive short positions on precious metals, face billions in potential losses — JP Morgan alone could see up to $13.7 billion in exposure as silver prices triple. New Basel III regulations and U.S. rules effective January 2026 have forced banks to scramble for physical metal, prohibiting further shorting of silver and exposing vulnerabilities. This volatility echoes the 2008 crisis, where small failures snowballed into systemic meltdown.

Already we have witnessed the first bank collapse of 2026. On January 30, Illinois regulators shuttered Metropolitan Capital Bank & Trust in Chicago due to "unsafe and unsound conditions." With $261 million in assets, the bank succumbed to prolonged losses from

low-interest-era loans amid high rates, costing the FDIC's Deposit Insurance Fund $19.7 million. This follows 2025's closures such as Pulaski Savings Bank, but experts warn of broader contagion, with $337 billion in unrealized losses looming across the sector and $1.8 trillion in commercial real estate debt maturing. X posts highlight the chaos, with users noting gold, silver, and Bitcoin sell-offs amid these events.

This turbulence underscores the changing nature of banking. For the first time, non-banks — hedge funds, insurance companies, money market funds, mutual funds, and private equity — hold more than half of global financial assets, reaching $256.8 trillion in 2024, or 51 percent of the total, per the Financial Stability Board's latest report. Growing at 9.4 percent — double the banking sector's pace — these "shadow banks" now dominate.

Corporations are also a part of the changing financial landscape. Apple Inc., for instance, has evolved into a de facto bank, leveraging its vast cash reserves — exceeding $200 billion — to extend credit and financial services without the regulatory oversight of traditional banks. Through initiatives such as Apple Pay Later and Apple Card Monthly Installments, the company directly loans money to consumers for device purchases and other expenses via its wholly owned subsidiary, Apple Financing LLC, which handles credit assessments, risk management, and lending decisions from Apple's own balance sheet rather than relying solely on partners such as the former Goldman Sachs or current JPMorgan. This mirrors shadow-banking practices, where non-bank entities engage in credit intermediation, such as buy now, pay later (BNPL) schemes and high-yield savings accounts, amplifying financial access but potentially heightening systemic risks of exploitation.

Even President Trump seemed to encourage this paradigm shift, by talking in 2025 of the "ancient" and outdated U.S. financial infrastructure, pushing for modernization via digital assets without a central bank digital currency. Through the GENIUS Act signed in July 2025, Trump aims to replace legacy systems with blockchain-based frameworks, enhancing stablecoins and crypto for payments. His administration's Working Group on Digital Assets recommended regulatory clarity

to bolster U.S. leadership, quietly preparing for a digital overhaul.

Could recent financial turbulence caused by shifts in the commodities markets be used to cripple traditional banks preparatory to ushering in the new corporate-driven digital system? — Rebecca Terrell

The UN Is Broke

United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres reports that his organization is facing insolvency. With a record $1.57 billion in dues remaining unpaid, it could run out of cash as early as July of this year. The UN faces an "imminent financial collapse" from lost U.S. dues, said BRICS reports.

The announcement reveals a larger pattern, coming on the heels of the United States formally withdrawing from the World Health Organization (WHO) in January. This move, cited by the administration as a response to WHO's alleged mishandling of the Covid-19 pandemic and undue influence from China, marks the culmination of a year-long process that included halting U.S. funding — previously about 20 percent of WHO's budget — and redirecting resources to bilateral health engagements. WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus warned that the decision endangers global health security, as the United States leaves a $260 million "debt" unpaid.

In his "America First" overhaul, Trump has defunded dozens of international programs deemed contrary to U.S. interests. His recent presidential memorandum

mandated exit from 66 organizations, including the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the UN Population Fund (UNFPA). The White House claims that the taxpayer dollars saved will support domestic priorities such as border security and industrial revival. Critics, including Amnesty International, decry it as a "vindictive effort to tear apart global cooperation," impacting climate action, gender equality, and humanitarian aid.

Compounding the turmoil, the United States has escalated tensions with NATO allies over Trump's persistent demands to acquire Greenland, a Danish territory vital for Arctic strategy. Threats of tariffs on European goods — starting at 10 percent in February 2026, escalating to 25 percent by June unless allies comply — have sparked fears of transatlantic rupture. Danish Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen warned that U.S. aggression could "end NATO," undermining Article 5's mutual defense clause. Bipartisan U.S. senators introduced the NATO Unity Protection Act to block funding for any seizure.

These actions reflect the 2025 National Security Strategy (NSS), which prioritizes "peace through strength," economic nationalism, and spheres of influence — reviving a "Donroe Doctrine" for U.S. control in the Western Hemisphere. Likewise, Germany — facing a budget crunch — is proposing a new two-tier EU model as the European Union, with the prospect of eroding U.S. support, seeks to get its economic house in order. Critics of the Trump administration's plans to abandon the post-WWII consensus are warning that fractured alliances might result in allies forging independent paths, with Europe eyeing closer ties to China amid U.S. noninterventionism.

The transition to an inward-looking phase was predicted by geopolitical strategists such as Peter Zeihan. In his book "The Disunited Nations," he wrote, "Many condemn Donald Trump for destroying the global Order. Let's be real here. If there is one thing that Americans on both the Left and Right agree on, it is that the United States should pursue a more modest role in foreign affairs. The push for an American retrenchment did not begin with Trump, nor will it end with him."

Yet Trump may not be the hero patriots long for. Painting himself as a one-off, he told *Politico*, "I don't think it's appropriate. The U.N. is not leaving New York, and it's not leaving the United States, because the U.N. has tremendous potential.... When I'm no longer around to settle wars, the U.N. can," he quipped, saying that the organization has "tremendous potential."

Does his insistence that the UN remain in New York contain an implicit acknowledgment of the growing economic dominance of alliances such as BRICS or adversaries such as China? Regardless, Trump obviously does not want to see an end to the sovereignty-eroding organization. — Rebecca Terrell

Countries Reaffirm Support for UN

Multiple countries, in rejecting membership in the Board of Peace chaired by U.S. President Donald Trump, have reaffirmed their support for the United Nations. The Associated Press reports:

> France, Spain and Slovenia declined Trump's offer by mentioning its overlapping and potentially conflicting agenda with the U.N.
>
> French President Emmanuel Macron said last week that the board goes beyond "the framework of Gaza and raises serious questions, in particular with respect to the principles and structure of the United Nations, which cannot be called into question."
>
> … "No single country should dictate terms based on its power, and a winner-takes-all approach is unacceptable," China's U.N. ambassador, Fu Cong, said at a Security Council meeting Monday.
>
> He called for the United Nations to be strengthened, not weakened, and said the Security Council's status and role "are irreplaceable."

These countries' claims about the Board of Peace circumventing or conflicting with the UN are ironic, since the UN Security Council, in Resolution 2803, authorized the board's creation in November.

These statements illustrate how the global elite continues to support and push for ever-stronger "global governance" under the UN, and how the United States, under President Donald Trump — as flawed as he is — and certain state governments, is arguably the only country doing anything whatsoever to push back against the UN. — Peter Rykowski

From Petrodollar Protection to Nuclear Revival: AI's Ironic Role in Currency Evolution

The petrodollar system, born in the 1970s amid the oil crisis, cemented U.S. dollar dominance through a pivotal U.S.-OPEC agreement: Saudi Arabia priced oil exclusively in dollars in exchange for military protection and economic ties. This arrangement ensured global demand for dollars, recycling oil revenues into U.S. Treasuries and sustaining American dominance. To preserve oil's scarcity and value — key to the petrodollar — nuclear energy, a potential abundant alternative, faced stigmatization. Post-Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, amplified by oil interests, nuclear development stalled in the West, keeping fossil fuels central to energy markets and bolstering oil's "precious" status.

Fast-forward 50 years: Exploding energy demands from AI data centers are reversing this trend.

As the artificial intelligence revolution accelerates, America's energy landscape faces unprecedented demands. Data centers, the backbone of AI operations, are projected to consume more than 500 terawatt-hours (TWh) globally this year, representing about two percent of worldwide electricity usage — a sharp rise from 1.5 percent in 2024. In the United States alone, AI-driven facilities could account for eight to 12 percent of total electricity demand by 2030, straining an aging grid and highlighting the folly of relying on intermittent renewables pushed by globalist agendas.

This surge underscores a critical truth: True energy independence requires reliable, baseload power sources free from foreign dependencies and bureaucratic overreach.

Enter nuclear energy, poised to provide the antidote to AI's voracious appetite. Small modular reactors (SMRs), with their factory-built designs and scalable deployment, are leading the charge. China's Linglong One, the world's first commercial land-based SMR, is set to come online this year, but America isn't far behind. The Department of Energy (DOE) has committed up to $800 million for projects such as TVA's Clinch River site and Holtec's Palisades revival, targeting operations in the early 2030s. These SMRs promise quicker builds — 12-24 months versus decades for traditional plants — reducing capital risks and enabling domestic manufacturing that bolsters national sovereignty.

Ironically, the data centers — which are driving the demand for small modular reactors — are hastening the petrodollar's retirement. As nuclear scales, oil demand becomes less critical to the financial system, accelerating

de-dollarization trends. BRICS nations and others are shifting to local currencies, central bank digital currencies (CBDC), and stablecoins for trade, with China's digital yuan and UAE's CBDC pilots bypassing dollar rails. Stablecoins offer programmable, borderless alternatives, potentially evolving into a hybrid system blending dollar stability with blockchain efficiency. This phases out pure petrodollar reliance toward a digital framework, where U.S. influence persists via regulated tokens, but oil's grip loosens.

Proponents of the change paint an optimistic picture, saying that energy independence from nuclear revival spurs economic growth. Lower electricity prices (20 to 80 percent drops by 2040) boost productivity, as energy costs often exceed labor costs for corporations. President Trump has previously said that if American energy is cheap, then it will attract manufacturing companies back to the United States, creating more jobs and more opportunity. Critics, however, have a less-rosy appraisal, saying that these changes bring us one step closer to a digital surveillance state as programmable money poses a threat to citizens since it can be remotely "shut off" if a person is deemed to be a dissident. — Rebecca Terrell

Trump Sues JPMorgan for Debanking His Family After J6

President Donald Trump is suing JPMorgan Chase and its CEO Jamie Dimon for $5 billion. The suit, lodged in a Florida state court on January 22, alleges that the bank engaged in "political debanking" by closing accounts belonging to Trump, his family, and the Trump Organization shortly after January 6, 2021. Trump claims this was a malicious act driven by ideological bias, violating the bank's policies and causing reputational harm.

JPMorgan has denied the accusations, insisting closures were based on regulatory and legal risks, not politics. This case highlights conservative concerns over "debanking," where financial institutions discriminate against right-leaning individuals or industries such as firearms and fossil fuels.

The profound irony is that while Trump rails against debanking as an act of financial censorship, his administration is actively championing programmable digital currencies that could institutionalize such practices on a grander scale. Through the GENIUS Act — signed into law by Trump in July 2025 — the United States has established a federal framework for stablecoins, dollar-pegged digital assets designed for seamless, programmable transactions. The Act mandates 1:1 backing with low-risk assets such as U.S. Treasuries, positioning stablecoins as a tool to bolster dollar dominance and blockchain innovation. Trump has hailed it as making America the "undisputed leader in digital assets."

Programmable currency, however, introduces the ability to enforce conditions on funds — freezing accounts for non-compliance, expiring money, or restricting uses based on user behavior. Critics warn this mirrors the surveillance fears associated with Communist China, whose central bank experimented with the digital yuan. The Chinese currency is touted as soon coming with an expiration date, meaning that if you don't use it by a certain time-period, it gets erased. Workers will no longer be able to save and are condemned to work like a hamster on a wheel in perpetuity, incapable of passing down wealth to heirs). Programmable currency also comes with a kill-switch, if dissidents ever fall afoul of the government. People will be "locked out" of their own currency.

Trump's push extends beyond the GENIUS Act. His executive order promotes blockchain rails for "open, programmable money," and family ties to crypto ventures amplify this shift. (Trump recently co-founded, with the Witkoff family, World Liberty Financial, which deals in stablecoins and blockchain products.) While suing JPMorgan spotlights corporate overreach, these policies risk empowering a hybrid system where tech

giants and regulators wield unprecedented financial control. This contradiction highlights a critical question for constitutionalists: Can one fight selective financial exclusion while advancing tools that could universalize it? As stablecoins proliferate, the line between innovation and surveillance blurs, threatening the very freedoms Trump wants a court to uphold in his own particular case. — Rebecca Terrell

Clintons Agree to Testify in House Epstein Investigation Amid Contempt Threat

Former President Bill Clinton and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have finally agreed to testify before the House Oversight Committee as part of its ongoing probe into the activities of convicted sex offender Jeffrey Epstein. The announcement came on February 2, just days before the Republican-led House was set to vote on holding the couple in criminal contempt of Congress for defying subpoenas issued last August. This reversal highlights the persistent scrutiny over elite connections to Epstein, whose 2019 death in federal custody fueled widespread suspicions of cover-ups among powerful figures.

The investigation, spearheaded by Representative James Comer (R-Ky.), chairman of the House Oversight and Accountability Committee, seeks to uncover details about Epstein's network, including his ties to high-profile individuals. Epstein, a financier convicted in 2008 for procuring underage girls for prostitution, had documented associations with Bill Clinton, who flew on Epstein's private jet multiple times between 2002 and 2003, according to flight logs released in court documents. But the connections may be even deeper, if one goes by a 2007 letter from Epstein's lawyers (Alan Dershowitz and Gerald Lefcourt) that stated that Epstein was one of the original group of people who conceptualized the Clinton Global Initiative.

The Clintons have consistently denied any knowledge of Epstein's criminal activities, with Bill's office stating in 2019 that he "knows nothing about the terrible crimes" and ceased contact after Epstein's first conviction. Hillary Clinton, who has no direct links mentioned in the subpoenas, was included in the probe, raising questions about the breadth of congressional inquiries into political families.

For six months the Clintons resisted the subpoenas, arguing they had already provided written responses and that further testimony was unnecessary. Comer pushed for contempt resolutions, which advanced through committee last month on a bipartisan vote. A full House vote was scheduled for Wednesday, February 4, potentially leading to referrals to the Justice Department for prosecution — a rare move against former officials that could result in fines or imprisonment.

The breakthrough occurred when attorneys for the Clintons emailed Comer's staff, agreeing to closed-door depositions on "mutually agreeable dates." Clinton spokesman Angel Ureña posted on X: "They negotiated in good faith. You did not... But the former President and former Secretary of State will be there. They look forward to setting a precedent that applies to everyone." Comer responded cautiously, stating he would insist on sworn testimony to fulfill the subpoenas but was reconsidering the contempt vote.

Critics argue the probe is politically motivated, targeting Democrats in a Republican-controlled House, while

supporters see it as essential to dismantling potential elite protections that allowed Epstein's operations to persist. The Department of Justice's recent release of three million pages of Epstein files is adding fuel to fiery debates over accountability in Washington.

Will the Clintons' testimony shed light on Epstein's enablers, or reinforce claims of a two-tiered justice system favoring the powerful? With public trust in institutions at historic lows, this inquiry could either restore faith or serve as a feint to engage in damage control as part of a larger coverup. — Rebecca Terrell

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

Report: UAE Royal's Investment in Trump Crypto Firm Preceded Major U.S. AI Chip Access

What Are They Hiding? Epstein Files Missing Key Revelations

Why Don't Democrats Want Voter ID? Democrats Tell Us Honestly This Time

Child Labor Laws or Parental Rights: States Push Back Against Federalized Youth Work Mandates

Globalist "Diversity" Push: Purposely Making the West Less White and Less Patriotic

A Closer Look at the Deep State's Top Enemy: The John Birch Society

Does Science Belong to God or Caesar? Top Scientist Slams Climate Alarmism

Former CIA Analyst Larry Johnson on Trump's Interventionism in Iran, Venezula, and Greenland

Jury Awards Detransitioner $2 Million for Medical Malpractice

Notre Dame Appoints Pro-abortion Population-control Advocate to Directorship

[END]